

Remarks

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his careful consideration of this application.

Reconsideration of this application is now respectfully requested in view of the amendments above and the following remarks.

Claims 1-30 are now pending in the application, with Claims 1, 14, and 21 being the independent claims. Each of Claims 1, 14, 18, and 21 has been amended. Claims 1, 14, and 21 have been amended to specify that the switching arrangement switches a load on and off (as discussed, for example, at Page 5, lines 5-7 of the Specification), and Claim 18 has been amended to correct a typographical error. New Claims 28-30 have been added; it is respectfully submitted that these claims are supported at least by Figs. 2 and 3.

In the Office Action, at Pages 2-4, Claims 1-10 and 14-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Fleischer (U.S. Patent No. 4,529,888) and Dassonville (U.S. Patent No. 4,370,607). Furthermore, at Pages 4-6, Claims 11-13 and 25-27 are rejected, also under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over the same combination of references, and further in view of Ashley (U.S. Patent No. 5,070,441). These rejections are respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

The invention, for example, as claimed in Claim 1 (as amended), comprises a switching arrangement, **adapted to switch a load on and off**, that includes a plurality of modules, to each of which signals are to be applied. Each module carries two current transformer secondary

windings. There is also a primary transformer loop in the form of a transmission line that is common to all of the modules, and which couples with the two secondary transformer windings of each module.

In contrast, Fleischer, noting, e.g., cols. 1-2, discloses a high-voltage solid-state relay circuit used to ensure that a highly inductive load connected across two terminals (10 and 11 in Fig. 1) is turned on. That is, **the relay circuit of Fleischer is arranged merely to ensure that the load is turned on and does not function to switch a load on and off.** Hence, the circuit disclosed in Fleischer is significantly different from the claimed invention.

In view of this, a skilled artisan would not have combined the features of Dassonville with those of Fleischer to arrive at the claimed invention. Additionally, as discussed in Applicant's Amendment and Reply of June 23, 2003 (see Pages 9-10), Dassonville fails to disclose other claimed features; those arguments are hereby incorporated into this Amendment and Reply.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 14, and 21 are allowable over the cited prior art. It is further submitted that, for at least the same reasons, their dependent claims, Claims 2-13 and 28, 15-20 and 29, and 22-27 and 30, respectively, are also allowable.

In addition, there are further arguments in connection with Claims 6-8, 18-20, and 24. In particular, all of these claims include a limitation that ***the transmission line include a load resistor***. The Office Action relies on Fig. 2 of Dassonville to teach the use of such a load resistor. However, Fig. 2 of Dassonville shows no such load resistor. In particular, **R3 is not a**

load resistor, but, as discussed at col. 3, lines 21-23, is a resistor that serves to limit current to a switch (Q2). Furthermore, given that R3 is not a load resistor, as claimed, it would not be obvious to relocate it to the center of the transmission line. Consequently, Applicant can not find the claimed feature anywhere in Dassonville. Therefore, for this additional reason, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 6-8, 18-20, and 24 are allowable over the cited prior art.

With respect to Claims 11-13 and 25-27, having to do with the use of electrostatic shielding, Fleischer, noting col. 2, lines 52-56, states that the disclosed relay circuit satisfies VDE requirements for isolation based on the position of terminals 10 and 11 with respect to the input circuit components. The Office Action relies on Ashley to teach the use of electrostatic shielding. In particular, Ashley teaches the use of electrostatic shielding to provide electrostatic isolation (see, e.g., col. 2, lines 39-41). As a result, a skilled artisan would not have been motivated to modify the circuit of Fleischer using the teachings of Ashley, **as the problem solved by the use of electrostatic shielding in Ashley has otherwise been addressed in Fleischer**. For these additional reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 11-13 and 25-27 are allowable over the cited prior art.

New Claims 28-30 depend, respectively, from independent Claims 1, 14, and 21. These new claims recite the presence of at least two DC power sources and a plurality of switches coupling one of the at least two DC power sources to the claimed transmission line at any given time. None of the applied references (Fleischer, Dassonville, and Ashley) discloses such an arrangement. It is, therefore, respectfully submitted that Claims 28-30 are allowable over the cited prior art.

Applicant: RICHARDSON
Appl. No. 09/725,175


Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 15, 2004



Jeffrey W. Gluck, Ph.D.
Registration No. 44,457
VENABLE LLP
P.O. Box 34385
Washington, D.C. 20043-9998
Telephone: (202) 962-4800
Direct Dial: (202) 344-8017
Telefax: (202) 962-8300